

### REMARKS

In the Office Action dated August 11, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 137-143 and 150 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Chung et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,442,124; rejected claims 144, 145 and 147 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable in view of Chung and Maruyama, U.S. Patent No. 6,191,889; rejected claim 149 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable in view of Chung, Maruyama, and Nomura et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,936,782; and objected to claims 146 and 148 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. According to the Examiner, claims 146 and 148 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By this amendment, Applicants amend claims 137 and 148, cancel claims 144-146, and add new dependent claims 151-161. Amended claim 137 corresponds to indicated allowable, cancelled claim 146, and indicated allowable claim 148 has been rewritten in independent form. In amended claim 137, "ring-shaped diffractive surface" from claim 145 is changed to read "ring-shaped diffractive portion." This change does not narrow the scope of the recited objective lens.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 1, 2004

By: 

Michael R. Kelly  
Reg. No. 33,921